

Plumas/Sierra Counties Pesticide Enforcement Program Statistics

	2008	2009	2010
Operator identification numbers issued/amended ¹	21	35	61
Restricted material permits issued/amended ¹	21	33	26
Permits denied ¹	0	0	0
Multi-year permits ¹	0	0	0
Total permitted sites ^{1, 2}	0	7	0
Notices of intent (NOIs) reviewed ¹	8	11	14
NOIs assessed (Pre-application site inspections) ¹	1	1	0
NOIs denied ¹	0	0	0
Pounds of pesticide applied (active ingredient) ³	59,541	26,028	6,356
Number of agricultural applications ³	576	258	149
Number of non-agricultural applications ^{3,4}	23,117	4,825	8,878
Number of all inspections ¹	3	5	4
Unclaimed Gas Tax Distribution ^{5,6}	\$26,149	\$1,907	\$24,120
Pesticide Mill Assessment ⁵	\$61,200	\$62,424	\$64,200

Footnotes

¹ Source: Pesticide Regulatory Activities Monthly Report (PRAMR)

² Some counties did not report any permitted sites.

³ Source: Department of Pesticide Regulation Pesticide Use Report Database


⁴ Analysis of data indicates some problems with reporting and accurately recording these figures.

⁵ Funding is on a fiscal year basis and is based on the prior year's workload.


⁶ Funding is on a fiscal year basis. This amount represents 36 percent of the full amount distributed by CDFA for all 10 agricultural programs (FAC 2282) and pesticide use enforcement. The 36 percent represents the typical amount dedicated to pesticide use enforcement.

Plumas and Sierra Counties Pesticide Regulatory Activities Monthly Report Calendar Year Summary

**Percentage of Licensed Work Hours Reported By Category
During Calendar Years 2008, 2009, and 2010**



**Number of Licensed Work Hours Reported By Category
For Calendar Years 2008, 2009, and 2010**



Plumas and Sierra Counties Inspection Compliance

	Calendar Year 2008							Calendar Year 2009							Calendar Year 2010						
	Criteria Compliance							Criteria Compliance							Criteria Compliance						
Inspection Type	Number of Inspections	Items That Did Comply	Items That Did Not Comply	Total Items	Rate	Inspections With a Violation	Inspections with 100% Compliance	Number of Inspections	Items That Did Comply	Items That Did Not Comply	Total Items	Rate	Inspections With a Violation	Inspections with 100% Compliance	Number of Inspections	Items That Did Comply	Items That Did Not Comply	Total Items	Rate	Inspections With a Violation	Inspections with 100% Compliance
Agricultural																					
Field Worker Safety	0							0							0						
Pesticide Use - Application	2	30		30	100.0%		100.0%	1	18		18	100.0%		100.0%	1	14		14	100.0%		100.0%
Pesticide Use - Mix Load	1	21		21	100.0%		100.0%	1	19		19	100.0%		100.0%	0						
Commodity Fume	0							0							0						
Field Fumigation	0							0							0						
Records	0							0							0						
Totals:	3	51		51	100.0%		100.0%	2	37		37	100.0%		100.0%	1	14		14	100.0%		100.0%
Structural																					
Fumigation	0							1	26		26	100.0%		100.0%	0						
Non-Fumigation Application	0							0							0						
Non-Fumigation Mix Load	0							0							0						
Records	0							0							0						
Totals:	0							1	26		26	100.0%		100.0%	0						
Overall Totals:	3	51		51	100.0%		100.0%	3	63		63	100.0%		100.0%	1	14		14	100.0%		100.0%

Plumas and Sierra Counties Closed Compliance Actions and Closed Enforcement Actions

	2008		2009		2010	
	Hours	Numbers	Hours	Numbers	Hours	Numbers
VIII. Compliance Actions						
A. Warning Letters / Violation Notices		1		0		0
B. Cease and Desist Orders		0		0		0
C. Documented Compliance Interviews		0		0		0
Total:	4	1	0	0	0	0
IX. Enforcement Actions						
A. Administrative Action:						
1. Restricted Materials Permit		0		0		0
2. Private Applicator Certifications		0		0		0
3. County Registrations		0		0		0
4. Structural Civil Penalties		0		0		0
5. Agricultural Civil Penalties		0		0		0
B. Judicial Actions:						
1. Notice to Appear (Citations)		0		0		0
2. Cases Submitted to DA		0		0		0
3. Civil Complaints Filed		0		0		0
4. Criminal Complaints Filed		0		0		0
C. Referrals to DPR		0		0		0
Total:	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: Compliance and Enforcement actions are not necessarily taken in the same fiscal year when the violation occurs. Additionally, some actions may be due to discovery of violations by means other than inspections such as through investigations.

Most Common Agricultural Inspection Violations

Elements Evaluated	2008 Criteria Evaluated			2009 Criteria Evaluated			2010 Criteria Evaluated			Overall 2008 - 2010 Criteria Evaluated			
	Met	Not Met	Total	Met	Not Met	Total	Met	Not Met	Total	Met	Not Met	Total	Percent Compliance
There were no agricultural inspection violations reported in this county between 2008 and 2010.													

Most Common Structural Inspection Violations

Elements Evaluated	2008 Criteria Evaluated			2009 Criteria Evaluated			2010 Criteria Evaluated			Overall 2008 - 2010 Criteria Evaluated			
	Met	Not Met	Total	Met	Not Met	Total	Met	Not Met	Total	Met	Not Met	Total	Percent Compliance
There were no structural inspection violations reported in this county between 2008 and 2010.													

Most Common Agricultural Inspection Violations

Elements Evaluated	2008 Criteria Evaluated			2009 Criteria Evaluated			2010 Criteria Evaluated			Overall 2008 - 2010 Criteria Evaluated			
	Met	Not Met	Total	Met	Not Met	Total	Met	Not Met	Total	Met	Not Met	Total	Percent Compliance
There were no agricultural inspections reported in this county between 2008 and 2010.													

Most Common Structural Inspection Violations

Elements Evaluated	2008 Criteria Evaluated			2009 Criteria Evaluated			2010 Criteria Evaluated			Overall 2008 - 2010 Criteria Evaluated			
	Met	Not Met	Total	Met	Not Met	Total	Met	Not Met	Total	Met	Not Met	Total	Percent Compliance
There were no structural inspections reported in this county between 2008 and 2010.													